# MYSTICISM AND OTHER ESSAYS

J. P. D. LLWYD, D.C.L.
DEAN OF NOVA SCOTIA

# MYSTICISM
# AND OTHER ESSAYS

# MYSTICISM AND OTHER ESSAYS

BY

THE VERY REVEREND
J. P. D. LLWYD, D.C.L.

DEAN OF NOVA SCOTIA

TORONTO: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY OF CANADA LIMITED, AT ST. MARTIN'S HOUSE

1926

COPYRIGHT, CANADA, 1926
BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY OF CANADA LIMITED

PRINTED IN CANADA

T. H. BEST PRINTING CO., LIMITED
TORONTO, ONT.

# PREFACE

These essays put forward no claim to special merit either as regards style or content. They simply represent the effort of a very busy clergyman to make real to himself a few of the movements of the human mind in his own day. They are published in deference to the wish of a number of friends who read them on their first appearance as review articles, and have expressed a desire to possess them in the more permanent form of a book. If in that form they prove of assistance to readers who lack the leisure for the study of more learned treatises upon the subjects dealt with, their mission will have been fulfilled.

J. P. D. Llwyd.

*Cathedral of All Saints,*
*Halifax, Nova Scotia.*

# CONTENTS


| | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I. | MYSTICISM AND UNITY - - - - - | 1 |
| II. | REVELATION AND SCIENCE - - - - | 31 |
| III. | DISTRIBUTIVE COURAGE - - - - - | 56 |
| IV. | RELIGION AND THE NEW PSYCHOLOGY | 70 |
| V. | LENIN AND LINCOLN - - - - - - | 87 |

# MYSTICISM AND OTHER ESSAYS

## MYSTICISM AND UNITY

"Have you met Callender?", was the question asked by a clerical friend in Southsea during my stay in England a few years ago? We had been discussing sermons and preachers.

In response to my negative he went on, "Callender is wonderful, *sui generis,* a nonpareil. He lectures every Sunday evening during the season to about twenty-five of the best known people in London—judges, authors, professors. You must have a card of invitation to get in; the house in Brompton belongs to one of his followers. There is the lecture at 6.30, then supper and social chat for the evening. When my spiritual reservoirs go dry, I go up to London and hear Callender. He recharges the batteries

and I run on for a while longer. Yes, you can get to know him. I will write for a card to his next Sunday's lecture."

Sunday evening came, and on presenting the card at the address named, I was ushered into a drawing room occupied by a small circle of people. On a dais at the end was a smooth-shaven man of about sixty-five, ruddy in feature, and dressed like a clergyman. He had just begun to speak, though without rising from his seat. He was giving an exposition of St. Paul's epistle to the Ephesians. For forty-five minutes he poured forth a stream of rich and elevated thought, clothed in diction chaste, concise, imaginative, powerful. He did not appear to refer to notes; it was a species of rhapsody, a speaking with tongues which was yet intelligible to the understanding; a prophecy.

Later in our acquaintance his history was told by friends. He was a priest of the Anglican Church, an Oxford man of high standing, a contemporary and friend of Liddon and the later Tractarians. His talents and convictions had made him the hope of the High Churchmen of the university. He became rector of a large parish with a considerable

staff of clergy, working there with success for ten years. Becoming dissatisfied with his religious position, he went into retirement. Finally he organized a monastic brotherhood without vows for the pursuit of the contemplative life, supporting it by his own private means. He began to study the writings of the great mystics, and learned to believe at length that mysticism held the key to that more intimate union with God of which he was in search. At last he renounced monastic ways, married, and resolved to devote himself to an apostleship of mystical teaching. He organized a small circle of friends to be imbued with the opinions upon life and God and the soul which had so impressed him. Without breaking away from the Church or from the external side of Anglican religion, the education of this handful of students became his special vocation—a vocation through which English religion and English character were slowly to be leavened. Already he had done much. One of his disciples had become the most famous preacher in England. He was anticipating an hour when mysticism should have unified Christendom from within,

through the Church's entrance upon an immediate consciousness of God. In such union and enjoyment the ravished believers would realize their oneness and forget the barriers of dogma, ceremony, and prejudice set up by antiquity to divide them.

I could not help seeing in Callender and his group of followers an exemplification of certain forces which move all down the field of church history. Content to keep in the background of progress, rarely attempting any such propaganda as brings a sect or a leader into prominence, it is mainly in moments when the veil of history parts asunder that these actors behind the scenes of the church drama can be discerned at work. Their influence has been in the inverse ratio of their self-advertisement. In them, as ever, quality has triumphed over quantity; intensity over magnitude and dimension. They are examples of the law that silent forces are the real powers, and that the mightiest of these silent powers is just *Life, Spiritual Life.*

What is Mysticism, this thing of quietness and confidence, and yet of strength? Definitions are dangerous things; they often recall Punch's famous definition of dogma as an

opinion laid down with a snarl. To define is to generalize, but it is not easy to give a comprehensive name to the individual films in the moving picture of mysticism. Mysticism is a spirit as well as a movement in Christian history. In the first sense it is that mood of exalted feeling into which every new birth of spiritual life introduces us; a fruitful cause of good to Christendom—fusing in the white heat of devotion many of the steel bulkheads which divide the ship of the church into watertight compartments. As a historical movement, it is less easy of analysis. However, just as in the higher calculus, results may be reached by approximations rather than by exactitudes, so here our hope must be to reach a working definition, rather than a perfect one. Lehmann has perhaps reached this in his saying that the kernel of the difference between Christianity and mysticism is the difference between *Fellowship and Union.*

Mysticism, then, will be that aspect of religion whose object is immediate union with God, whose conception of union is absorption rather than fellowship, and whose pathway of attainment lies through contemplation, as-

ceticism, or ecstasy. Let us look at this a little more closely.

Some thinker—the poet Coleridge, I believe—has remarked that all human beings are either Platonists or Aristotelians. Consciously or unconsciously, the work of thinking is done by human beings on one or other of the lines laid down by those two pioneer thinkers of Greece. A similar broad classification of religious phenomena might be attempted into Subjective and Objective—those modes of approach to the Divine which emphasize the inward experiences of the spirit, and those whose stress is chiefly laid upon instrumentalities or revelations external to the believer. These are the two poles of religion, with belts of more temperate climate along the spiritual equator where the better elements of each fall into harmony. One of them has Fetichism for its extreme, where symbol ceases to be symbol and becomes itself the object of worship; the other extreme is Pantheism, where the distinction between the One and the Many is lost, and the One remains the only final form of existence.

Careful students of religious history will agree that the theological conflicts of the ages

are at bottom conflicts between these rival points of view. Protestantism has been a battle for the subjective side of Christianity; Roman Catholicism a striving for its objective aspect; and only to-day are we growing to understand the possibility of a Neo-Catholicism (to quote Dr. Newman Smyth's word) which shall be a synthesis of the two.

Mysticism belongs in the Subjective category. Two points characterize it: the conception of union with the Deity, and the methods by which such a union is brought to pass.

The conception of union held by the mystics of all ages is not the commingling of minds and hearts known as fellowship, and illustrated so finely in Abraham's friendship with God, or in the close, personal relation between the disciples and the Master; it is rather the union of absorption, in which the lesser nature merges and is lost in the greater.

The Persian apologue of the Sufis is a familiar illustration. "Once a lover went and knocked at his beloved's door. 'Who is there?' was asked. 'It is I', said the lover. The voice spake back soft and low: 'There is not room in this house for me and thee.'

Then the lover went away and prayed and fasted in solitude. A year passed away and he came and knocked again. Once more the voice spake, 'Who is there?' 'Oh love', he answered, 'it is thyself', and the door was opened unto him."

Absorption does not always show itself in an extreme form; there are Christian mystics like St. Bernard and St. Teresa in whom the sacred fire has not wholly consumed the sense of individuality, yet mysticism considered in the large undoubtedly tends in that direction. The dervish spinning in his circle, the medicine man in his dance, the votary of Attis or Dionysus in his orgiastic festival, the initiate in the mysteries of Eleusis or of Sabazius, agree with the followers of Plotinus, or the students of Dionysius the Areopagite, and even with the followers of George Fox in seeking a mental exaltation in which the human consciousness practically merges in the Divine. The conception of Deity may differ; the degree of absorption may vary; but the essential idea is the same; union is regarded as involving identity of nature rather than of sympathy.

Ample proof of these statements is furnished by a brief review of the history of the cult. It is absent from the New Testament. Holtzmann's question, "Was Jesus an Ecstatic?" for which he marshals with much labour every proof enabling him to answer, "Yes", has been replied to in the negative by Loisy, who points out in the *Critical Review* that the marks of genuine ecstasy are wanting in Christ, e.g. unconsciousness or the unmanning of the man, and that the enthusiasm of Christ and His apostles is always sane. The triplet, Asceticism, Ecstasy, Intuition, says Lehmann, has no root in the gospel. Its first real appearance in the Christian era is with Gnosticism at the point where Platonism began to be absorbed into Christianity. The root distinction between Platonism and Christianity is that in the first redemption is through knowledge, in the second, through Faith. This distinction is not only Platonic in contrast to Christian, it is Greek in contrast to Jewish, and Aryan in contrast to Semitic. Dean Inge of St. Paul's has pointed out that St. John uses the verb "I know"; but never the noun "knowledge", as if to guard against confusion with Gnostic

ideas. Philo shows that influence. "The inspired man, He upon whom God has in truth poured out His breath, can with good reason call himself God." Clement of Alexandria speaks of knowledge as scientific faith, and makes "purification" the path to it; Origen holds similar opinions; indeed these two writers reveal the profound difference between the East and the West.

In the East all development consists in demonstration; in the West it consists in regeneration. In the first a tradition is given whose content must be unfolded but not varied from or reinterpreted; in the West the tradition is the same but is susceptible of unceasing renewal by Life. The influence of mystical thought came to a head in the Eastern Church in the writings of the Pseudo-Dionysius, where it is taught that God is above all Threeness and Oneness. His doctrine of union runs as follows: "All thinking and perception given up, all that can be perceived and thought, all that is and is not, in ignorance man ascends to the Unity which exists above all Being and Knowledge. There he plunges into the mystic Darkness and Unconsciousness, where all

known distinctions vanish, then is he one with the perfectly Unknowable, and through unity with the Unknowable he becomes like God. . . . ."

In the West, Augustine's Confessions contain traces of this view, but perhaps a clearer expression is reached in the love-mysticism of Francis of Assisi, the saint of the stigmata, as it overflows in the poetry of the singer, Jacopone dei Todi:

> Love, Love, beloved Jesus:
> Love, I will die embracing Thee.
> Sweet Love, Jesus my Bridegroom:
> Love, Love, Jesus thou Best One
> Give me Thyself; transformed into Thee,
> Think, that I would be beside myself
> Knowing nothing of myself:
> Jesus my Hope,
> Come now, slumber in Love.

Following in his steps came Molinos, of whom Shorthouse paints so noble a portrait in his novel *John Inglesant.* His doctrines might have led to the formation of a school in the Church of Rome where every member would be permitted to realize the Highest through direct communion apart from confession or priest. At first popular, the Jesuits ultimately crushed him. His farewell to Inglesant breathes the passion of quietness: "Adieu, Cavaliere; we shall meet

again one day, when the veil shall be taken away from the face of God and we shall see Him as He is." The golden chain of rare, unworldly souls embraces also the mystics of France, Mme. Guyon and her sister spirit, Mme. de Chantal, whose lovely parable of the pillar must be quoted:—"Could the pillar in its grotto speak and should one ask it, 'Why movest thou not?' 'Because my Lord and Master wills that I stay motionless.' 'To what servest thou here?' 'I exist only to obey the will of my Lord.' 'But thou seest Him not?' 'No, but He sees me, and joys that I stay where He set me.' 'Would'st thou not rather have power to move nearer to Him?' 'No, not without His command.' 'Hast thou no wish then?' 'No, for I stand where my Lord and Master has placed me. His good pleasure in me is the only thing that rejoices my soul.' "

In Germany Mysticism is supported by three great names, Eckhart, Suso, Tauler. Eckhart's language is bold for the year 1327: "Is God in all things, even in the water we drink, then grace must be everywhere in Nature. What need then of priestly mediation and of sacramental apparatus?" He had got

at the inference drawn long before him by Persian and Hindoo thinkers: "Why wander longer on the way of deeds, when we have reached the way of knowledge? Why letter and messenger when I rest already on the Sultan's breast?" Tauler, who had been taught by that interesting society, the Friends of God, and who was also a man of practical sense, gave a beautiful setting to the idea:—"We are created and called to great things, therefore we must give God room within us that we may bring them to pass." The tradition runs on through those exquisite words of Thomas A. Kempis:—"There are four things which bring much peace: Seek rather to do another's will than thine own. Wish rather for little than much. Choose rather the lowest than the highest place. Pray always that God's will may be done in thee and through thee." Then came the group of Spanish mystics, with St. Teresa as their leader, equal to Catherine of Siena in practical genius but greater in depth of soul. Curiously enough her psychology placed the seat of personality in the will as some psychologists do to-day, but with what a different result.

One variety of mysticism, the intellectual, appears chiefly in times of transition and theological flux. The religious formula has been found wearisome and hearts are throbbing with the hope of a future free from the storm of controversy and yet secure with Truth. A certain phase of this leads straight to the Modernism which treats the facts of historical Christianity as if they were the

> huge cloudy symbols of a high romance

or parables only of a Higher Truth eternal in the heavens. He who aims to reach truth by direct intuition, however, will fail to gain popularity. He is too aloof from the people, too far in the upper air, too remote from the average mental life of man, for the rank and file to follow him. Hence Mysticism reveals itself among the less intellectual classes mainly in the form of exalted feeling and emotion. God is interpreted as the Infinite Beauty and Love; the soul's yearning is for complete oneness with that Beauty through enthusiasm and excitement. The experiences of such men as St. Bernard and St. Bonaventure, the visions of St. Hildegard and St. Teresa, the ecstasies of nuns and anchorites in mediaeval days have a parallel among us

in the wonderful conversions of early Salvationism and a host of similar experiences throughout Christendom. The Russian and Greek Orthodox Churches have borne an abundance of such fruit; for example, the monks of Athos, and the Saints of the Lavrys or Monasteries of Slavic Christianity. Tolstoi, though a rebel against church authority, approached the same position in his insistence upon the intuition of the Divine.

A further characteristic of Mysticism is that it is a religion of the small group. Propaganda, if any exists, is mainly through the influence of a few friends forming a tiny circle with little or no organization, and extending almost without conscious effort. The Brethren of the Common Life, and the Quakers of our own day are cases in point. It is to the honour of the latter that they have been a power for good in civilization out of all proportion to their numbers.

When, therefore, we come to that which is the first object of our study, viz., the place of Mysticism in the movement towards Christian Unity, our attitude can only be one of qualified assent. Certain facts in the life of Christendom seem to point towards the

helpfulness of this form of religious experience, while others point as clearly in the opposite direction.

(1) The first of the hopeful signs is the fact that our age is one of transition, and that Mysticism is a natural product of such periods. The new view of the universe which came in with Copernicus, Galileo, and Newton; the prevalence of the theory of evolution; the widening of men's horizon through discovery and invention; the application to the Bible of the sciences of historical criticism and of comparative religion have shaken Christendom out of the fetters of tradition and are compelling a restatement of many cherished beliefs. The Church will weather this tempest as she has weathered so many others in the might of the Personality Who dominates all storms with the words "Peace be still." From one viewpoint the sky is full of promise. Forces once outside are clamouring for recognition within. The day of the dualism which we inherited from the Middle Ages is past. The whole of life has begun to feel the effect of religion. Hence the existence of what is known as Christianity outside the Church. The whole of life is also

affecting the Church for good. So long, however, as theology is in confusion, unable to digest and assimilate the New Learning, so long will the non-theological mind, lay and clerical, seek to pass behind the strife and controversy, and to find in mystical experiences what appears to be a certain and immediate conviction of the reality of God and Truth. Here, I think, lies one of the reasons for its renascence among us. We are dwelling in a situation akin to that illustrated in India by the history of the Brahma-Samaj, the life-work of Devendra Nath Tagore, and of his son, the mystical poet, Rabindra Nath Tagore. The mythology of Brahmanism has fallen away from their minds—

"the deity of the ruined temple remains unworshipped in deathless neglect."

From outworn institutions the spirit flies to the universal Soul in such words as these:

"What divine drink wouldst thou have, my God, from this overflowing cup of my life?"

"My poet, is it thy delight to see thy creation through my eyes and to stand at the portals of my ears silently to listen to thine own eternal harmony?"

"Thy word is bearing words in my mind and thy joy is adding music to them. Thou givest thyself to me in love and then feelest thine own entire sweetness in me."

So in the welter of intellectual confusion many among us who regard faith as the pearl of great price not to be sacrificed for the paste jewels of negation and denial, seek for a Christianity which stands apart from institutions and introduces the spirit into the silence of the Eternal Presence where Truth is known because it is felt.

What the Church of the future is to be is still on the knees of Providence. Is it to be a synthesis of all types now existing, according to the dream of some? Undoubtedly there is something precious and worth preserving in the distinctive features of each form of Christian creed and social fellowship, a something which ought not to be lost. The struggles and heroisms of Christian history were not mere shadow fights, nor mere tilting at windmills; realities were at stake, and the substance of those realities will be required for the building of the perfect temple to come.

Or is the future Church to be arrived at through the predominance of one powerful type, asserting itself in harmony with the law of the survival of the fittest—as the normal and final system—by reason of its power

to include the best in every lesser system? May we interpret it to the imagination under the figure of a vigorous young oak growing amidst ancient ruins, threading its roots among the nicks and crevices of the stones, and through the broken windows of the decaying structure, until the whole ruin is a mass of foliage, and destruction has been swallowed up in the flood of green life? The wisest answer to such questions is a confession of ignorance. We do not know. This whole movement towards unity between the Churches is in the hands of a Higher Guidance than ours; many forces are combining to produce it; it may be something new and undreamt of is in store for us.

> Our little systems have their day,
> They have their day and cease to be.
> They are but broken lights of Thee,
> And Thou, O God, art more than they.

The really significant fact to look at is the steady emergence into the foreground of the things that are fundamental, and the drift towards the disregard or reinterpretation of non-essential facts for which our fathers would have bled and died. There gains ground every day the conviction that among these fundamentals one of the most import-

ant values is that of Christian experience. The demonstration of the Spirit is thrusting into second place the appeal to history and to logic. A new apologetic is being framed, based on the appeal to life. The Church states its great argument nowadays in Pauline phrase: "It pleased God to reveal His Son in me." For the cumbersome apparatus of scholasticism is being substituted the simpler pragmatism which accords with the genius of our age. Truth is tested by its working value, just as life vindicates its presence every where by manifesting the phenomena of life. It is here that religious life strikes a keynote that chimes with Mysticism. Later we shall see the defects of this standpoint; for the present it suffices to point to the noble services it is rendering to the cause of union. The fact is emphasized that Christianity is fundamentally an experience with God, and that all institutionalism is worthless unless it leads man to a genuine spiritual life, a commingling of heart and soul with the Divine. I do not mean that the grand outlines of the Christian Church as it was sculptured by the hands of Christ and his apostles are

destined to alter in the stream of progress, but only such conceptions and human interpretations of those outlines as have risen and flourished and then mysteriously changed under pressure from the hidden impulse of life within. The teaching of the mystic that there is a secret Light that lighteth every man has surely had its effect in preparing the Church for that modification of institutional forms which must always come from the reaction of religious earnestness upon its environment.

(2) A further contribution to unity on the part of Mysticism lies in its emphasis upon that of which mention has already been made, the value of the group as an agent of reform. This is not part of any intended programme. It is rather an inevitable outcome of the solitude of the mystic, and of the fact that his way of thought and life are such as to command the adhesion of only a few select souls. But it is none the less an element of strength. The small community of intense life has again and again exemplified its influence in history. Little circles of Greek scholars driven out of Constantinople by the Turks in

1453, carrying with them the ancient manuscripts, and settling at Bologna, Padua, Paris, Oxford and elsewhere, broke the chain of slavery to scholastic philosophy, poured the fresh current of classic knowledge into the mind of Europe, influenced the sixteenth century with Renaissance ideas, and made the task of the Reformation thrice easier than otherwise could have been. The philosophy which gave birth to the French Revolution spread from small centres; so likewise did the Romantic movement of literature in England as with the Lake poets, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Southey; so again in times nearer to our own has Labour found its freedom through small unions in town and village, while Christian Socialism has covered the Anglo-Saxon world with small coteries of students. There is more hope in the little conferences upon Christian unity suggested by the World Conference on Faith and Order than in many bolder and more ambitious schemes. I would not decry or lightly esteem any effort in that direction, whether in the way of corporate reunion or federation, or inter-denominational comity, or the segregation of territory in the missionary field. All

are helpful, in their failures no less than in their successes, for the movement has only just reached the educational stage. But one thing is certain, that the planting of such centres throughout the civilized world must stimulate good understanding and foster sympathy. For before we comprehend each other's theology, we must have come together as men—so to rid ourselves of the ingrained prejudice and misconception built into our mental selves by a long ancestry of theological difference. To distinguish between the truth and error in a brother's thinking, it is not enough to know his position. I must know *him*; and vice versa, he must know me or men who feel as I feel and think as I think. Temperament is at the root of most forms of division.

The positive contributions of mystical modes of thought and living to the larger Church are these: Emphasis on Christianity as an experience with Christ the equivalent of God; emphasis upon the unfolding of one form of Christian life into another and a higher, the spirit being superior to the form; emphasis also upon the importance of small circles in the training of an age in the

appreciation of progressive movements from within itself. From these points of view Mysticism may be regarded as a partial solvent of formula and organization, unifying men upon the basis of a common experience. Such a viewpoint is of great value, especially in times of transition and during the reconstruction period which must ultimately come. For then any aspect of thought which emphasizes the soul of religion as trust, dependence, love, will aid man in preserving a calm and tranquil spirit in face of doubt. *I have felt God, therefore I know.*

Mysticism, however, can never become a complete Eirenicon to our splintered and shattered Christendom. Such a hope is a delusion. Even in the brief exposition here attempted the limitations of the theory must have become apparent; yet before closing this study a brief glance at the negative aspect will be necessary. Mysticism fails in relation to the Church; to the Deity; to man; and to history.

(1) The Church. Religion has its organic side. The experience of the individual in conversion, in faith, in sanctification, in vision, cannot be enjoyed *in vacuo,* it depends in

part upon the environment supplied by the Church of God. Bible, Sacrament, worship, church architecture and ceremonial, of whatever kind these last may be, are the environment of holiness, and provide the individual believer with food from the Christ without for the Christ within. No cult which ignores the value of the Church of Christ can ever be a complete power for the unification of that Church. This age needs not less churchmanship, but more, only of a more spiritual quality. If Christianity is an experience, it is also a collective experience, the building together of innumerable souls into the Temple of redeemed humanity. The corporate life helps to feed and to inspire the life of each unit, furnishing that unit also with opportunities of service whereby his life may add its contribution to the whole. In this day we speak much of the solidarity of mankind. The personality of each one of us realizes itself through service to his fellows, like the motto on the sword of Athos in the Three Musketeers, "All for one and one for all." Mysticism is weak here. It bids man rest in personal communion instead of treating that as the starting point for a venture of

faith on behalf of the salvation of his brethren. Moreover, by its exaggeration of rapture and ecstasy, it tends to weaken the hold even of individual religion upon many. The hard-headed, practical man who rarely experiences such exaltation, comes to regard religion as the privilege of a few highly organized souls whose temperaments and whose susceptible nervous systems make them psychic to the Divine.

(2) But Mysticism cannot be an Eirenicon for the divisions of Christianity for another reason—the defects in its doctrine of God. On the philosophical side, as in the case of Plotinus, the Neo-Platonists, and the Pseudo-Areopagite, it so exaggerates the transcendence of God, His superiority to all our conceptions and doctrines of Him, as to leave Him practically outside the grasp of the human mind altogether. It either reduces Him to a mere nothing without qualities, or renders necessary a series of gradations through which His approach to man becomes possible. On the emotional side Mysticism errs in the direction of Pantheism. Groping after a union which is really absorption, it tends to blur distinctions which are vital to

all true religion, the distinction between God and man, between spirit and matter, between good and evil, and between subject and object. Such views touch the frontiers of immorality, witness the history of the Gnostic sects which held them in the second century. The true doctrine of God emphasizes his transcendence without denying that He can be known; it believes in a *unio mystica* between Him and man without any sacrifice of the distinctions of either; its union is not absorption, but fellowship, in which the greater nature enfolds, penetrates, and exalts the lower; not to the impairment but to the heightening and perfecting of every faculty, talent, and power, that makes man a person. Systems which exaggerate either of these elements at the expense of the other can only fail to furnish a real basis of truth for union.

(3) So also is it as regards Mysticism's doctrine of man. That doctrine assumes the possibility of union between man and the Absolute apart from the mediatorial work of Christ. St. Paul's text would then read not "Through Him", but "Through our own consciousness we have access by one Spirit unto the Father." Scripture says through *Christ*,

and St. Paul is here sustained in his teaching by the express words of the Truth itself: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son Who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." The principle of mediation with respect to religion finds illustration all through life. The gifts of life—knowledge, education, refinement, physical competency, are mediated to us through others or through society and civilization. Maroon a babe on some island in the tropic seas, and if it grows up at all, it will probably grow up half-idiotic. As the man is, so is his debt to a myriad agencies of mediation on which he has depended for the unfolding of his powers. No system which ignores this law of life can aspire to lead us towards a unity whose very condition is that it be brought into existence through a mediatorial Church.

(4) I might criticize Mysticism also, as regards man, on the score of intellectual weakness, lack of clear thinking, and other sins against normal mental life, but I pass on to my last point, which is that Mysticism lacks reverence for history. Pure Subjectivism can never have adequate respect for the col-

lective past of mankind. The experiences of each man become a law unto himself, they need no checking by the experience of bygone ages. His own thought, his own visions, his own ecstasies suffice him. Hence may spring a towering pride, whose subtle intoxication sets the individual apart in a Paradise of sweets and perfumes into which none else may enter. But in the treatment of Christian union, history is indispensable, for "history is Philosophy teaching by example." The record of our Christian past is a mine of wisdom and of warning. To shut oneself up in the prison of subjective impressions and excitements, in blindness to that great life which lies behind us, is to make necessary in each man's career the recapitulation of all former experience that he may gain the wisdom requisite for the conduct of life. If such folly is absurd in lesser concerns, how monumental in absurdity does it appear when dealing with a world-wide movement like unity, whose evolution runs far into the past, and whose roots are intertwined so closely with the unfolding of our whole civilization.

In fine, the mystic can teach us the value of the soul's personal converse with Christ, the

value of the element of progress in faith, and the value of small centres as the nuclei of progress. In all these he makes distinct contributions to the great cause of the unification of the Christian Church. But he cannot teach us the value of corporate religion, nor the proportion of the faith as touching God, nor the value of the mediatorial work of Christ, nor the wisdom of a proper attitude towards that wonderful past of the church, which amidst all its errors and blunders and even its crimes, shows everywhere the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and teems with witnessings of Providence.

## REVELATION AND SCIENCE

IN certain respects a parallel may be drawn between the thirteenth century and the present age. The shift of population which was so marked a characteristic of the earlier part of the Christian era, had just given way to the first glow of the passion for nationality. The unity of all civilization under ecclesiastical sway, dreamt of by Hildebrand, had been demonstrated by the conflict raging between Guelph and Ghibelline to be the baseless fabric of diseased ambition. The scattered peoples in the north of Italy and in other parts of the empire had begun to seek after national unity, a search destined to find its goal only after a weary experience of strife and bloodshed. Chief among the features of that century was the movement in the field of intellect and theology, led by the Schoolmen, which aimed at the unification of all existing knowledge in terms of Catholicism interpreted in the light of the philosophy of the Stagirite.

Out of this were born some great names—Aquinas, Occam, Duns Scotus and other lights of the theological realm—whose teaching is still a power upon certain types of mind, and whose thought gave tone and colour to the still greater personalities of Giotto and Dante, in the succeeding age. From the intellectual point of view, the time was constructive. Its aim was to comprehend all known learning, and to re-state it in terms of the Christian creed. Nor must the dryness of mind everywhere prevailing, nor the grotesque and irrational forms resulting from an unscientific effort after completeness of statement, lead us to under-value the manifest hunger for a clear interpretation of the universe in terms of the highest then known.

During the century past we have again been face to face with great shifts of population; we are also now in the presence of a vast philosophical and scientific movement; we are once more witnessing the pangs of new nations just striving to be born. Moreover, the movement of destructive criticism which began in the middle of the eighteenth century, and which spread from Germany all over the field of European thought, seems to

have reached its flood-tide, and to be giving way to a new epoch of constructive work. The faith of Christendom, apparently shaken to the foundations, is revealing anew the capacity, so often noticed by historians, to absorb and to reproduce as its own the very doctrines under whose onset it formerly reeled. Greece once again "rises from the dead, the New Testament in her hand." There are signs that the warfare between science and religion is slackening; certainly a "truce of God" is in existence for the moment. The smoke of combat is clearing away, the faces of the combatants are being revealed to each other, the points of agreement and correspondence are emerging. A new fearlessness is growing in the church. A tendency is rising among public men, in the words of a university president, "to look to religious institutions as the best, in some cases almost the only, solution for problems where sociology fails to provide a remedy." The same thing is to be seen in the growth of the psychological method in the study of religion. History is repeating itself, and the wheel is coming full circle in the relations between the

newer learning and the ancient faith. No nation was ever more exclusive, or more bitter in hatred of foreign peoples, than the Jews. Yet the history of Jewish monotheism after the exile is the history of a steady assimilation of conceptions of God and the unseen world drawn from the experience of this people in Babylon and Persia, even their very language having been influenced by such associations.

It was to be expected that a similar process would operate in the unfolding of Christian theology. The words of the church's Founder, "He will lead you into all truth," are the index and prophecy of her future. Truth revealed is viewed by the Revealer as an adequate interpretation of human life in its outlook upon past, present, and future, only in so far as that truth is regarded in the light of an organism, unfolding as an organism unfolds, flourishing even amidst influences whose antagonism to its own nature at first appears deadly; able to absorb and assimilate to itself the best of current thinking; able to subject that current thinking to the tests of religious certitude, and, by the action of a sure and irresistible instinct,

to cast aside the error. Thus the essence of Plato's philosophy passes into the blood of Christendom through St. Augustine. In the effort of the Schoolmen to find Aristotle in the Bible, in the desire of Erasmus to take up into Christianity the New Learning, in the power exerted upon the minds of Tractarian writers by Romanticism, we see examples of the remarkable intuition which leads the Christian church to the absorption of any elements of real worth in her intellectual environment, and to the rejection of that which closer inspection proves untrue.

It is a question if any fiercer attack has ever been made upon the central positions of theology than during the last fifty years. The force of the attack has been more than doubled by the fact that it has been convergent, bringing its artillery into play not from the same quarter at different times, but as the combined effort of several antagonisms springing into existence within short periods of each other. Physical science threatened in the latter part of the nineteenth century to shatter the entire fabric of Christianity. It attacked certain ideas of creation and of the origin of the intellectual and moral nature

of man, which had become part of the warp and woof of current interpretations of the creeds. The sensation caused by the appearance of Darwin's "Origin of Species," by the trenchant writings of such men as Tyndall and Huxley in England, and of Cabanis and Haeckel on the continent, was immense and profound. It is not too much to say that for a time the faith of many staggered under the blow dealt by this compact array of scientific fact, despite the intermixture of much that was more or less doubtful hypothesis. In candour it must also be acknowledged that the line of defence at first adopted was not such as to restore public confidence or to reinstate theology in the eyes even of its friends. The champions of the faith rallied to the support of interpretations which the progress of investigation had clearly shown to be beyond their power to hold, and which were in no wise part of essential truth. For a while, controversy raged with a heat and fierceness unknown since the days of the Reformation. Suddenly the new ideas revealed their mastery; they showed themselves as already part of the very atmosphere men breathed. It became manifest that the church

itself was permeated with their influence. It was easy to see that she had nothing to gain and everything to lose by the attempt to fortify positions deduced from mistaken views of Scripture and of the world, and cherished in a day when the scientific method had not yet been born.

Historical criticism seconded the attack of physical science. Following lines laid decades earlier by the physician Astruc and his successors Graf and Vatke, the school of critical research arose, with Wellhausen and Kuenen for its representatives upon the continent, and Cheyne as its type in England. The motto might be stated briefly, "Handle the Bible like any other book." The critical method of study began to be applied to the sacred records of religion with what appeared to be devastating effect. The records were dissected into shreds; their unity was denied; questions of authorship which had been regarded as settled for ages were reopened; many hands were discovered in their compilation; old conclusions upon chronology, titles, and arrangement were challenged; sections supposed to be history were proclaimed to be myth or legend; until it seem-

ed to Christian orthodoxy as if the very foundations of the faith were crumbling under the feet of the believer, or sinking out of sight in the quicksands of mythology. In such a crisis it would have been little less than a miracle if the plan of defence had been wholly wise and well judged. It was natural that the destructive tendency of criticism should be emphasized to the neglect of the constructive; that Christendom's answer should have expressed the incoherence of panic; that the vital distinction should not be made, in the words of Driver, "between a criticism which attacked the *form* of revelation, and a criticism which struck at its *essence.*"

A far more insidious onslaught is now in progress from the side of the new science of Comparative Religion. Instead of a frontal attack, this is an enveloping movement, aiming to cut off communications with the unseen. The object of some able expositors of this science appears to be to suggest a naturalistic interpretation of the facts and phenomena of revelation by tracing out resemblances between Christianity and other religions, and thus striking at the supernatural.

Christianity then becomes a mere product of the religious instinct within humanity, possibly a higher product, it may even be the highest so far attained, but nothing more. Its unique dignity has vanished; it may be superseded in the march of evolution; there is nothing absolute or final about it. In the words of J. G. Frazer, "The question of the validity or truth of Christian creeds cannot, perhaps, be wholly dissociated from the question of their origin. If, for example, we discover that doctrines which we had accepted with implicit faith from tradition have their close analogies in the barbarous superstitions of ignorant savages, we can hardly help suspecting that our own cherished doctrines may have originated in the similar superstitions of our rude forefathers; and the suspicion inevitably shakes the confidence with which we had hitherto regarded these articles of our own faith."

The vast erudition of Dr. Frazer here seems to be used to prove that because Christian faith and ritual have their prototypes among the cults of inferior races, therefore the former stand upon no higher basis of truth or value than the latter. The same ar-

gument applied to philosophy and science would discourage every student from the hope of realizing in the future a more perfect form of knowledge than in the past. To explain the more perfect wholly by the less perfect is surely to commit the blunder of explaining the higher by the lower. Nor is it at all necessary that comparative religion should bear such fruit. The treatment of its material by such a man as Jevons leads to conclusions quite other than those of Dr. Frazer. Foreshadowings of higher truth and practice among heathen peoples might argue for Christianity as the goal and fulfilment of the world's religious past, rather than for Christianity as only one futile example among many of the human mind's attitude in dreaming over the mystery of the world and of things to come. At least, that construction of the matter may be deemed allowable in an age which sees in astrology and alchemy prophets and forerunners of scientific truth, Any other hypothesis inverts the argument of Butler's analogy. That argument, roughly stated, runs thus, "The universe is one. Therefore the two worlds of matter and spirit are one; the product of one universal

mind. Hence the resemblances between natural religion and revealed." Invert this argument and it becomes "The universe is one. Resemblances exist between natural and supernatural religion. Therefore supernatural religion is a mere thing of nature after all."

The real centre of attack here is the principle of revelation itself. To the tremendous question, whether there has ever been any direct communication from the mind of God to the mind of man, the answer is Nature, and Nature only. All revelation is human in its origin, the product of man's brooding over the world and his relation to it. Earlier stages of this mood show us dogmas, rites, and ceremonies, crude, barbarous and often brutal. Later stages take on more enlightened forms and reach more artistic and attractive expression; none the less, they are the mind's children, and acknowledge no afflatus from the divine.

Such a position makes real religion impossible. If religion is the bond of a fellowship, if it is a commerce between man and unseen powers, then the movement involved in that commerce cannot be merely human, but must

be matched by a corresponding movement from above. Fellowship is a dual expression of life. It presupposes two beings entering, along whatever lines of mystery, into converse with each other.

The first natural outburst against such views as these has been followed by a saner attitude. The invective of a church outraged in some of her deepest convictions has softened into a calmer and more rational method of protest. After all, truth will prevail, and truth is elicited only by patient and steady investigation into the theories offered under its name. The growth of this attitude in the church was admirably shadowed forth in a sermon preached by an Archbishop at the opening of a Church Congress some years ago; "We cannot too earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints, nor too rigorously regard as immutable the great foundations of Christian truth as they are contained in the Holy Scriptures, and in the creeds of the church; but the terms in which that truth has been stated, whether in the writings of individual Christians, however eminent, or in the confessions of separate branches of the church, may well require

from time to time some reconsideration. From age to age there ought to be a growing apprehension of the purport of the great message and of its bearing on personal needs, conditioned by the progress of knowledge and the spiritual circumstances of each existing age. There is no reason why we should not reconsider our statements of doctrine, if under the guidance of the Holy Spirit they might be made more helpful to the welfare of the church and to the comfort of individuals. Are there not, in the estimation of most of us, one or two at least of the Thirty-nine Articles which might be brought more into accordance with the needs as well as the spirit of the present day."

More than half a century since, the writers of "Essays and Reviews" pleaded for a readjustment of the relative positions of science and theology. Now that the storm called up by that famous treatise has spent its force, it is difficult to understand why so conservative a restatement should have ruffled the waves of the theological sea. Thought soon began to interest itself in the problem at the great universities of England. In the early eighties, a circle of young Oxford schol-

ars, whose names have since become famous as among the ablest advocates of the faith, issued a manifesto under the title of "Lux Mundi." The writers numbered representative thinkers, such as Dr. Gore, once Bishop of Oxford; Dr. Scott Holland, late Regius Professor of Divinity at Christ Church; the lamented Aubrey Moore, whose premature death lost to the Church of England a mind of rare promise; and others of equal reputation. The declared purpose of the book was to rewrite the "Religion of the Incarnation," a re-interpretation of the main positions of theology in the language of an age steeped in scientific and historical method. Many still believe that no abler or more satisfactory exposition has been put forth. In the sister university the same movement voiced itself later in such volumes as the "Cambridge Theological and Biblical Essays." At the present time the conclusions announced in these works and in kindred literature are known to be the accepted outfit of scholars. The work in book and magazine of such men as Driver and Sanday has rendered immense service, not only to their own communion, but to the entire Christian world, in quieting and

giving confidence to the minds of perplexed believers as to the result of the application to the Bible of the methods not of destructive but of constructive critical study. Other communions have felt the same influence. Such scholars as Robertson Smith, Milligan, Dods, and Forsyth, are examples.

Even strange growths have not been wanting, growths like that curious blend of Christianity and Pantheism, known as the New Theology, whose deity was the source of evil as well as of good, and whose eternal Christ was an idealized perfection bearing little relation to the historical Jesus of Nazareth. Such a phase needs only passing mention, inasmuch as its ablest champion has returned to a more defensible basis of conviction. Views, in some respects similar, have also appeared under the name of "Modernism" in that bulwark of orthodoxy, the Church of Rome. "Modernism" is a term covering a varied landscape of opinion, but it seems, from the writings of Loisy and other expositors, to be in general an endeavour to restate theology by emptying the life of the Jesus of history of everything beyond the range of our conceptions of force and law, and turn-

ing the idea of the living Christ into a sort of sublimated mysticism.

The problem of revelation was touched upon a few years ago by an able writer* with special reference to the contrast between the development of monotheism in Greece and its appearance in Palestine. In the case of the Greek, the steps by which that race emerged from polytheism into the idea of one infinite and universal spirit are traced with adequate knowledge and with much freshness of touch. The subject is dealt with in the light of the newer psychology. Granting the existence in polytheistic religion of many scattered germs of truth, the author regards it as, in his own phrase, an "uprush from the sub-conscious." The stages are outlined by which Greek thinkers were drawn away from polytheism to the study of nature, and then led by that study away from materialistic theories of the universe to the doctrine of one power and reason beneath all phenomena. A distinction is drawn between this intellectual process, a process resulting from the criticism of religion by life, and the religious

*Dr. Hamilton's "The People of God."

revelation or knowledge of God granted to the Jew.

Monotheistic belief, among the Hebrews, is explained as a "down-rush from the superconscious." The unique characteristic of Israel's assent to this creed is that it was the fruit of a personal experience on the part of the prophets of the Jewish race. It was an impression stamped upon the mental life of a few elect souls through personal intercourse with Yahweh. No rational process of thought was involved in the belief; it reached the mind of the interpreter in living ways, as a result of immediate contact with Unseen Reality. This experience was peculiar to Israel. It went on for centuries. It was repeated with individuals of varying temperaments and amidst diverse circumstances and environments. No other cult exhibits such phenomena; it occurs always in connexion with Yahweh, and with him alone. The worshipper of Marduk, or Baal, or Osiris, or Apollo, knows nothing of such an experience in connexion with his deity. The monotheism of Akhenaten is an obscure incident, while the monotheism of Hebrew prophecy is

essential to the very life and being of the Hebrew creed.

The religious system which grew up during the progress of ages, around this germinal revelation, was also a thing apart from all others in the extent to which it was interpenetrated with the idea of the presence and supremacy of One Holiness, Wisdom, and Truth. So far as this was the case, so far as the Jewish church's organization was free from notions and observances inconsistent with the pure spiritual monotheism of its prophets, so far might that system itself claim to be of divine origin, in agreement with the experience which gave it birth. From this point of view only was the Jewish system accepted as divine by Christ. His presence swept like a magnet through the nominal Israel, and drew to Himself the spiritual Israel, to be reconstituted into the society since known as the Christian church, whose representative on earth at the present hour is historic Christendom.

The theory of the Christian church advanced by Dr. Hamilton is that of an organism rather than an organization. To the Eucharist a central position is assigned.

It is regarded as the root and expression of principles so large and fruitful that the celebration of the rite and the full utterance of its teaching might be looked upon as the chief work of the church. It is the centre of worship; the means by which the church realizes the *unio mystica*—the bond of brotherhood, and the point of radiation for every form of fraternal and philanthropic service. So also the institutions appearing in the earliest days are organs called into existence by the Spirit for the performance of the church's work. The priesthood is an organ specialized for the celebration of the Holy Supper. The episcopate, at first identical with the presbyterate, is further specialized as the organ necessary for the securing of the principles of authority and continuity. And the main lines of the ecclesiastical structure developed during the first two centuries are treated from the same general point of view.

These subjects of bitter controversy are dealt with in a spirit both fair and scientific. With firm personal convictions is combined every willingness to accept the main conclusions of sound critical scholarship. The posi-

tions advanced however as to the origin and scope of revelation, and the bearing of such views upon Christian unity, call for a word or two of comment.

Little difference of opinion exists in the Church of to-day as to the way in which revealed truth reaches man. The theory of verbal inspiration has given way to the more Scriptural view of personal inspiration. Men of God wrote as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. The emphasis has passed from the Mohammedan theory of a sacred book, written letter for letter by celestial hands, to a stress upon personalities acting and speaking under divine influence, whose inspired deeds and words are recorded in the Bible. The divine and human elements are both recognized; revelation is from above, not from below; the medium alone is human—elect souls chosen to be the depositaries of truth. Small room for debate is left by the adoption of such a conception. It is in agreement with the well-established law of history that progress is as a rule through the activity of select personalities; and it is in further harmony with our best construction of prophetic experience.

Perhaps the views laid down as to the scope of revelation may be more open to challenge. Revelation is regarded as including at least an outline of organization. This is in collision with that body of Protestant opinion which recognizes religion in principle as divine, yet treats matters of church polity as of purely human origin. Dr. Hamilton's position, however, carries with it the weight of many names high in esteem in Anglican theology, not to speak of the sane and rational argument of Hooker, one of the deepest and most spiritual thinkers in the English Church, which might be quoted on his side. Frederic Denison Maurice, in his "Kingdom of Christ," bases the reasoning of his book upon the doctrine of a revelation including within itself certain lines of organic growth. The tendency is to develop similar lines of organization in every Christian society; a theory which throws light upon the fact of the simultaneous appearance of episcopacy all over Christendom in the second century, a fact which appears inexplicable upon any theory of the merely casual origin of ecclesiastical polity. Moreover, it furnishes an explanation of the steady evolu-

tion shown in church history towards balance of government, as between undue centralization of authority in the hands of one metropolitan see, and the proper distribution of it between hierarchy and laity; a balance of which the churches in communion with the Church of England afford happy illustration, through the representative system obtaining in their synods and conventions.

As all plans for Christian unity are influenced by theories of the Christian church and its organization, one can scarcely expect to find a high creed of episcopacy sympathetic to some of our modern recipes for unity. Almost all thoughtful men are agreed that the church should cease her divisions and that it is time for the age of reconciliation and of peace to begin to dawn. Moreover, the most belated conservative has learned at last to appreciate the services rendered by other bodies of Christians to the common cause—services undoubtedly attributable to the presence and working of the one Spirit. Yet it is equally certain that in the historic church, Reunion through the wholesale sacrifice of each church's distinctive features, meets with little favour. The "open

altar'' and the ''open pulpit'' plan, fascinating as it seems to many, and offering, as it appears to do, a short cut to unity, by the simple process of ignoring differences, is far too cheap and easy an expedient to meet the typal and temperamental antagonisms evolved through hundreds of years of separation. The futility of the method has been made clear by its failure to bring about union between the great Protestant bodies who have practised inter-communion for centuries. Modern Protestantism is being driven along the path to union not by the fraternal spirit engendered by inter-communion, but by the pressure of the great movement of modern missions. Heathendom and the Canadian North-West have sent forth a call of Macedonian intensity, and the realignment of the Christian host is our response. The growth of the social conscience has aided this, by uniting the churches as workers against civic evil, in spite of their organic separation. Inter-denominational co-operation, however, is a different thing from inter-communion, or from organic fusion, even as the great *pax Anglicana* differs from a blend of Anglo-Saxon nationalities. It is the duty of Chris-

tians of every name to stand shoulder to shoulder in the effort to illumine the dark spots of earth, and to redeem our modern cities from the vice and squalor and corruption, whose environment makes honour and virtue an impossibility. But the ultimate universal Church will not be furthered in its coming by hasty expedients which forget that our differences have a history and a reason, nor by any methods which overlook the fact that true unity is not uniformity but unity in variety, no more than the strength of the British army would be increased by clothing all its regiments in one uniform, or by obliterating each regimental type through the adoption of one common name.

At different periods philosophy has been a noble handmaid to theology, and there are not wanting signs that a similar rapport between them is now on the way. Is it too much to hope that when the present movement in philosophical thought has formulated its conclusions upon the problems of life and being, it may be found now as before, that our statements of Christian truth will profit from its investigations? A certain pessimism reveals itself as to what philosophy has done and is

doing, which might well be modified in future productions from the pen of writers upon topics fraught with such possibilities to the Kingdom of God and to the higher life of the world.

## DISTRIBUTIVE COURAGE

THE spectacular kinds of courage are not to be compared in value with the courage most of us require to live our daily life. Many motives may be in play to urge the football player or the racing oarsman to do his best—the plaudits of cheering thousands, perhaps even the dearest voices in the world may combine with native grit and pluck to stiffen his resolve. A martyr to truth may find fortitude for the despising of death in the faith that posterity will recognize that he is blazing out new tracks of thought in the forest of ignorance. There are many things other than truth itself which help to render a preacher fearless, or a soldier, a fireman, a life-saver brave. Our admiration for such public courage goes far—so far that the presence of heroism redeems even a bad cause in a sense. The ideas for which the aristocracy of France stood at the time of the French Revolution were death to human liberty, yet we cannot stint our respect for the cool,

proud fearlessness of spirit shown even by the children in the presence of the guillotine.

This is emergency courage, however. And the article most needed is everyday courage, that fights in the shade as well as in the sun, the power to bear and keep up the step of life's treadmill when there is nothing spectacular about it, nothing but a flat, mechanical routine, with no one to say a word of praise. One of the finest examples of courage is that of the founding of a certain great university, as it was disclosed some years ago in the autobiography of its first president. The battle fought for the realization of that dream was a tremendous one—a battle against enemies who marshalled every influence, good or bad, on their side; bribery, political jobbery, misrepresentation, ridicule, and even law. The institution stands as a monument of courage which could not understand when it was beaten. But that is only one signal instance of a sort of bravery which is being displayed in the private life of our people in the building of the university of human character, without recognition, without the knowledge of their fellows, at times against their

own hearts and in spite of the censure of those they love.

We need this *distributive* form of courage in many places and conditions. Let us note some of them. There is a kind of courage which might be called the *courage of fact*. It consists in the willingness to see things as they are instead of as our vanity and ambition would like them to be. It is the scientific man's form of the quality. He turns out of his mind every opinion formed beforehand and concentrates his vision upon the insect or the star under examination so as to find out the fact. It is the kind of courage we love to discover in our doctors. Lord Bacon praised it. He advised men to drive out of their minds the idols of the theatre and the market place—that is, the prejudices which had enslaved them—and to come to the study of Truth with an open intelligence. Its moral and religious applications are manifold. The courage of fact will not be blinded, either by itself or by what people think, into taking values for granted because they are popular.

For example, look at what people call progress. The courage of fact refuses to call anything progress that is on a purely per-

centage basis. Progress must make provision for everything there is in a man, his soul as well as his purse. The courage of fact refuses to believe that manhood can be measured by the dollar mark, or that six figures make a man anything more than a nondescript being. And it has the spirit to act upon its convictions, the courage to refuse to look upon a hundred and fifty dollar dress as entitling a woman to be called a lady. It thinks nothing more grotesque in all the comedy of life than to have books without knowing how to use them, or pictures and Wedgwood china which we have not turned from mere possessions into friends. And most of all, the courage of fact strips the sham from our fashion and conventionality. It dares to believe that the first essential of true life is obedience to God's law. *It plants itself squarely on the principle that apart from Christ and his religion there can be no true or lasting prosperity for the nation or the individual man.*

A man's real value to a community lies frequently in his refusal to do what it wants him to do. He is a good fellow so long as he spends as other men spend, dresses and wines

and goes the pace that other men set without reference to the ethics of the business, keeping within the lines of what is held respectable; which is only another proof that the community is in the sad position of not knowing what it really does want after all. The world's true benefactors are precisely those who will not do such things, whether their station be that of kings or only of boys dwelling under the household roof. The courage of reality uses disagreeable language about responsibility, trusteeship, culture, temperance, righteousness, and judgment to come. The world dislikes these terms. It goes to sleep murmuring "Pharisee" or "Puritan", and wakes up the next morning to find that *every ray of dawn in its sunrise is woven from the resistance of these stalwarts of the higher life.*

If courage is needed anywhere, it is certainly needed in the home. Of all the cowardices that human beings are responsible for, the most pitiful and tragic are those that are travesties of love. Marriage is a monopoly; it entitles two human beings to each other's exclusive society. How frequently that monopoly is a tyranny! There are husbands and

wives who construe affection so as to destroy each other's religious liberty. In the name of love they will interfere with the religious habits by which testimony is given to the God of Love. Love is made the accomplice of soul-murder or soul-starvation.

The courage which asserts its spiritual liberty is founded upon a strong sense of duty to God as the first being in the universe to whom obedience is due. Marriage is not a monopoly as respects God. The wife's and the husband's first duty is to Him. It is a degradation of a holy relationship when either partner lifts a finger, speaks a word, or looks a look that makes it difficult for the other to live a spiritual life.

There are no longer political tyrannies over us, but there may be and are petty tyrannies; and this is one of them, and men are often guilty of it. We do not ride roughshod over our wives, but we do make things awkward and uncomfortable for them when they do not fulfil our pleasure. It is a man's privilege to smooth the path of his wife's diviner life instead of strewing it with rocks by his selfish grumbling and complaints. Men run an awful risk in so doing—the risk of ex-

tinguishing the light that burns upon the altar in the sanctuary of a woman's soul.

It may seem severe and extreme, but my conscience compels me to say it, that whenever one party thus stands alone for her religion, it is her duty to be faithful to her God, her Saviour, and her Church. It is the only way to win respect for her convictions—it is the only way to bear witness on behalf of the Truth. A religion without courage is a religion that deserves to be despised. Those who are looking at us are wondering in secret if we really believe what we profess. To stand—even though alone—for Him who died for us, to occupy our seat alone in Church, to say our prayers without support or sympathy, to live a life in which the highest plane finds no response from those we love, is difficult, but it is great—it is like the life of the lonely Son of Man.

Another kind of courage we need greatly is the courage to stand by the idea of family discipline. The future of the boys and girls of this age is in peril from over-indulgence on the part of easy-going parents. This can be clearly proven from a comparison between the early upbringing of those very parents

and that of their children. It is good for us to provide the best schools and universities for the rising generation. It is good to furnish them with every means of proper culture. The State and the taxpayer cannot do too much on that line, for a nation depends upon education as an edifice depends upon its pillar. But it is a mistake to eliminate from young life the idea of work and effort. Children are granted too much liberty among us. Their pocket money is too generous in supply, their freedom in the evening is too unrestrained. It is usually a mistake for parents to try to give their children an *easier* youth than they had themselves. The influence upon a young person's character resulting from such a policy more than offsets the advantage of better mental training. The manhood which conquered our vast western wilderness, transforming it by labour of thew and sinew and brain into a theatre of wealth and power, was a manhood moulded in the school of hardship. Why should not a similar use of strength produce a like result in the case of this generation?

Mr. Henry G. Wells has stirred a note of warning about this in his book on the men in the moon. It is a parable of one-sidedness in education—the mind trained to the neglect of the conscience and the character. The moon people are mere extensions of this or that organ of the brain; and the Grand Lunar, the king of the planet, is only a huge and swollen intelligence. The novelist is saying to us: "Education needs proportion; the child's character must be trained in strength, and grit, and in the power to refuse and resist, or manhood and womanhood will be worthless."

Here and there are a few parents who use this principle as part of the organic law of home life. The concept of the family thus cherished is of the highest order. The roof-tree shelters the noblest hopes of the nation, and the training received under its refuge is such as befits the future citizens of any self-governing commonwealth. Such homes are the growing places where the seedling plants are nursed into vigour by skilful hands in preparation for the day of transplantation to the less-shielded open spaces of life. Endurance has brought into play the deeper

qualities needed to resist the forest and the storms that snap or wither so many of the weaker children of indulgence. The responsibility is a parental responsibility, not to be shouldered off upon another. No teacher, no friend, can stand *in loco parentis* in this particular. The baptism of character is a part of the family's priesthood.

Here, if anywhere, lies the failure of the average father. Immersed in business, prone to look upon our homes too much in the light of a haven of refuge from the street with its thousand cares and struggles, we men *unwittingly tamper with the holiest of trusts* in the interest of our personal tranquillity. We excuse ourselves from the duty of child-training on the ground of our placid faith that all things will come right, somehow, even without our help to make them right. "Such children as ours cannot go very far wrong." To help us in taking such an attitude come recollections of possible over-strictness upon the part of those entrusted with our early training. And we remember the fierce battles of our own youth. Love yearns to save these darlings of the heart from similar trial.

Much of this is right, but much of it is only fatalism, and fatalism is always ruinous to character wherever we find it. The same initiative is called for among one's children as in one's business, if family life is to be as shining a success as commerce. The other attitude is cowardly in its self-indulgence; and it doubles the burdens of the woman's side of the household.

"What shall I do with my husband?" said a wife to her rector one day. "He is as good and kind as he can be to us all, only he seems to leave all the hard work of household discipline to me. Our son wants to do things which I know are dangerous to his moral nature, but which, as he says, many other parents allow their boys to do. I was not permitted such liberty when I was young, nor were my brothers until they were young men. But the strain of refusal is wearing on my nerves, and my husband differs from me, thinks I am too strict, that the liberties in question won't harm the lad, etc. The whole burden of the children's moral and religious training falls on me. Why should men who love their wives in all else, fight shy of those parts of family discipline

which are after all, the essential shapers of character?''

The existence of problems such as this is of itself a heavy indictment against the modern man; but, to all of either sex who realize the responsibility of influence, these problems form our latter day battlegrounds of courage. The future of each nation is in the balance, awaiting the uprising of those scattered individuals in home or state or elsewhere who will represent the interests of conscience and Christ even though to do so involves the apparent denial of earthly affection. Such denials are the soul's last proof of fidelity to the highest love—that of the Universal Father. How singular it is that a power like love, designed by the Creator to knit human hearts together in bonds stronger than death, should so often prove a divider in the realm of the higher life! How strange that a force intended to lead human souls to a perception of the real nature of the essential Being of Him who is Love, should be perverted into a force that hinders the soul's access to Him! How much those followers of Christ, who are tempted to permit the unbelief or indolence of others near and

dear to overpower their own fidelity to Christian faith and worship, or their consciousness of solemn responsibility for influence, need to hear the stern "No compromise and no surrender" of that saying of Jesus, "Whosoever will come after me, and hateth not—in comparison with Me—father, mother, is not worthy of Me."

Here, then, is the field for the exercise of courage in our life. Not the field of war where the serried chivalries of nations meet in mortal shock and cover the earth with carnage; not the stake or the rack where martyrs exhale their last sigh heavenward in testimony to the truth;—but the dearer and more intimate circles of every day life; in market-place and street; in home and by the fireside; amidst the gaieties of society, and in the privacies surrounding the affections of the heart. Great indeed were the heroisms of that older world, but greater still are the sacrifices and the witnessings demanded of the present age—greater because devoid of external splendor and known only to the all-seeing eye of God.

That strange poem of Browning's, "Childe Roland", is a parable of spiritual courage.

Therein is portrayed the temptation to play the coward by giving up the quest for that Dark Tower where the soul's greatest battle must be fought, but where the soul's happiest secret may be learned. Through the wilderness of doubt and despair, amongst mocking shapes weaving their dance of death in anticipation of another victim, and in spite of all the sad records of former disaster, the knight presses on until he reaches the round, squat turret which is the goal of his search. Then comes the final test, the blowing of the horn that hangs by the gateway. It is fraught with all the peril of the unknown. But the fearless spirit rises above the threat of danger—it will know the worst and through that knowledge hope to reach the best.

"Dauntless the slug-horn to my lips I set, and blew,
Childe Roland to the Dark Tower came."

# RELIGION AND THE NEW PSYCHOLOGY

IT was inevitable that the experimental method of inquiry, after being applied to nearly every other branch of human study should be applied to psychology, the youngest sister in the family of the sciences. It is a striking fact that the Soul should never have been explored. The material available for the purpose is immense: from such human documents as the Confessions of St. Augustine and the Book of Job, to such dry discussions as Aristotle De Anima and the teaching of the Upanishads of India. Yet instead of basing its psychology upon a careful survey of this vast field, the scholarship of the past has, almost without exception, drawn its theory of mental phenomena from some form of unverified tradition. Judaism and primitive Christianity drew their ideas from the wells of Old Testament conception; the Alexandrian School of Theology from these and also from Plato; the Scholastics of

the Middle Ages from Aristotle; and the current notions of men in the street have been, all unknown to themselves, powerfully influenced by such doctrines and the more modern ideas of thinkers like Locke and Mill. The point is that there has been little serious attempt to bring into play the method of observation and experiment, to which our recent science owes so many of its triumphs in other branches of study.

The time was probably not ripe for this. The organ with which we scrutinize is often the last thing to be itself scrutinized. Eyes were observing objects for ages before man thought of turning his attention to the marvellous structure of the eye itself. And man had been thinking and suffering, and wondering and working for long before it occurred to him to ask questions as to the nature of the thing within him which was experiencing all this; and still longer before he began to realize that all his previous exploration of the universe had been only a prelude to the exploration of the Self which explores.

Perhaps also the extreme difficulty of the study may have daunted all but a few bold spirits, and turned them back from the ven-

ture. To exhaust such a subject is an attempt just as ridiculous to-day as in the days of Lavater or the phrenologists. Soul is a bottomless pit, or a ladder scaling heaven as we choose to look at it. Every human personality differs in detail from every other. The varieties are as numerous as the earth's population. One might say that a complete psychology will be impossible until the passing of the last man.

Notwithstanding all this, such a study is of enormous practical value. To a clergyman it can be of well nigh incalculable service. As preacher he must know something of the instrument upon which he aims to play. As pastor, working among individual souls, his success will depend largely upon his intimate understanding of the moods and dispositions of his people. To the physician, a knowledge of the connection between mental states and physical conditions will have great effect in the making of a diagnosis and deciding upon the remedies proper to be brought to bear. The business man has already learned the importance of this new Science, and an entire theory of commercial success is springing into prominence based

upon psychology and the facts arising out of it. Every student of human nature or of human history, as he scans the material before him, will realize the value of first hand information as to the structure and habits of the spirit within. Statesmen and orators will learn much from the department of group psychology. Sociologists have already begun to plan their mode of research upon the foundation of a thorough understanding of the inner working of the personality with whose social aspects they are called upon to deal.

The significance of psychology is thus universal. No curriculum of education will soon be regarded as complete without some attention to it. No theological training can be deemed adequate as an outfit for the work of furthering the Kingdom of God apart from a measure of acquaintance with a branch of learning so directly related to effective influence upon the higher life of men.

The New Psychology presents among many others, three chief points of new departure which stand out as characteristic, and as challenging particular consideration: its

theory of *Instinct,* its theory of the *Unconscious,* and its theory of *Suggestion.*

1. Its theory of *Instinct.* The Instincts are regarded by the principal writers as the basis of mental and moral life.

"It is the first and most essential postulate for the scientific study of the mind," says Dr. Barry "that all our mental processes rest upon, and are inextricably bound up with, the great inherited biological instincts by which life is preserved and reproduced." "The psychic life of the Saint or the pure thinker no less than that of the purely 'animal' man is deeply rooted in those ancestral instincts which brought life through its aeons of development to the gate of human consciousness. Our minds can no more disown these poor relations than our bodies can 'cut' the liver or the lungs."

Instinct is probably best understood as an extension or development of what is commonly called "Reflex-action", containing from the first a 'mental' element, which yet falls short of what we may call Intelligence. From the first we can distinguish in it the three characteristic elements of all develop-

ed mental processes—Knowing, Feeling, and Acting.

When a man's instinct of self preservation impels him to run away from danger, we can clearly analyse these three elements. "He perceives the dangerous object; he experiences the feelings or emotions which are stirred within him by the presence of danger; and the two result in the activity which sends him running down the road." This is in precise harmony with Dr. McDougall's definition in his Introduction to Social Psychology—the classic first book for every student. The distinctive factors in instinct are thus: an attention, an emotional experience, and an impulse to a specific train of action.

Among the leading instincts, are:—

| | |
|---|---|
| Self-assertion | Sex |
| Curiosity | Gregariousness |
| Pugnacity | Parental instinct |
| Flight | Feeding |

Sleep

Dr. Tennant in his book on the origin of Sin regards these as supplying the raw material out of which temptation is fashioned. "Sin consists very largely in their abuse.

An animal cannot lust, a man can." Every one will be reminded of S. Paul's remarkable analysis of the inner life in Romans VII—"I had not known sin apart from the law; for I had not known lust unless the law had said Thou shalt not lust: but sin finding occasion wrought in me through the commandment all manner of lust: for apart from the law, sin is dead."

Instinct is not to be repressed, but to be converted. Repression issues in disaster; it is the fruitful cause of nervous and mental disorders. Instincts cannot be changed or rooted out, but they can be "sublimated"; their energy can be transferred into other instinctive channels. A balked parental instinct often transfers itself to acquisitiveness; the childless man becomes a miser.

As regards the *Unconscious,* the new Psychology considers the mind as something like the records of a phonograph, ready at any time to reproduce forgotten material from the past. Below the threshold of the conscious mind are the subterranean chambers of buried thought and experience. Dreams, mental tricks, association of ideas, inspirations, wandering thoughts in prayer,

even the flashes of genius, are all uprushes from this extraordinary region. The phenomenon of the split self has its seat here as in the case of Miss Beauchamp of whom Drs. Prince and Sidis have written.

Within this mysterious realm tiny systems of thought and emotion, called Complexes, are formed around the great instincts, whose influence upon the upper life is tremendous. Here is the source of monomanias, of fads, of crazes, and of most of the crimes or blunders of sex. Freud, the German, goes so far as to make sex the basis of all character, but in this he is not accompanied by the majority of his fellow-teachers. The analysis of the subject runs into strange channels. I quote from Hart's Psychology of Insanity. "A Sunday School teacher suddenly became an Atheist. He read up the subject and argued weightily, demolishing all the traditional 'proofs' of God. He honestly thought that these arguments were his reasons. But the real reason was, as was afterwards discovered, that he had been jilted by a lady who taught the girls in the same Sunday School. The intense force of the associations led him to welcome every argument

telling against the thoughts connected with those disappointing Sunday afternoons."

It is quite clear that a careful study of one's unconscious mind, ought to afford a great training in humility.

*Suggestion* is defined by Baudouin as the sub-conscious realization of an idea. For example, when a problem which has baffled us overnight is found to have been solved on our awakening in the morning; or, as in common experience, when an elusive line of thought is elaborated somehow during sleep and blossoms out into a full-blown sermon in the morning. The unconscious has done the work for us. Suggestion is simply the deliberate use of the machinery which is here disclosed. There are three stages:

The presentation of the suggestion by another or by the patient to himself.

Its acceptance by the patient.

Its transformation into Act.

The explanation of this is new, but the knowledge itself is as old as the human race. Magic and witchcraft as still practised by savage tribes are more or less abuses of this power. The negro medicine-man utters his malediction upon some trembling victim, the

curse takes effect, and at the appointed time, the man dies. It is suggestion. On the side of devotion, the miracles of healing in Scripture and Christian history, the extraordinary cures of psycho-therapy, and indeed, the long and glorious list of the victories of faith are to be credited wholly or in part to this strange and remarkable power.

In its relation to Religion the New Psychology stands as a challenge. The nineteenth century Church made a colossal blunder in its first attitude towards Evolution. Huxley was right when he put down Bishop Wilberforce on a platform in Oxford after the latter had ridiculed men who believed in descent from monkeys. "I have ascended from my ancestors, he has descended from his." Science deserves respect. Truth is *one*. Somewhere there must be harmony between revelation and discovery; let us be patient and find it. The scientific student is God's priest like ourselves, but in a different sphere. To call the New Psychology atheism, or rank subjectivism as some are prone to do, is to repeat the blunder of the last generation. The first question is not "Does it agree with our theology, but is it true?"

The next question is "What modifications are requisite in our theology contingent upon its truth?"

As to the truth of this new interpretation of the mind, one thing needs emphasis. A vast body of facts has already been collected: the work of able and independent seekers for truth all over the world. These facts have been sifted with the most rigid care, and the most unsparing criticism; the dross has been thrown away and the pure gold alone retained. The classification of these facts is in the main outline, complete and final; so far as we can see, change of a radical sort is not likely. Such an ascertained and ordered system of observation cannot exist without an attempt to relate it to the rest of our knowledge. It stands before us; it confronts us; its inductions as to the nature and functions of the inner man must somehow be in fundamental agreement with the truth taught in Scripture and with the assumptions and beliefs of the Christian Religion. Otherwise we are faced by an impossible dualism, and there is no such thing as a real universe—one coherent scheme of things

springing from the mind of the *One* and *Only God.*

Our starting point therefore must be that at bottom the New Psychology and Christianity rightly interpreted are in agreement, an agreement not perhaps at first apparent, but emerging as the result of patient fair-minded search.

Immense encouragement is given to this point of view by what has been already said in the definition of Instinct. Train the instincts, says the psychologist, do not repress them. For the spiritual method thus indicated is the educational, and this is in exact correspondence with the whole method of the Church in her treatment of the soul, a method rooted in the principle that character is a spiritual discipline. It is a satisfaction to find a mode of treatment consecrated by the experience of ages, thus in agreement with the most recent research.

The New Psychology also opens up some theological insights of much interest and helpfulness. I must not pause more than to glance at the strange idea put forth by Dr. Sanday a year or two before his death, that the Unconscious might have been the vehicle

or dwelling place of the Deity of our Lord. Certainly that is a novel conception of the abode of the Shekinah. A more probable application of the theory is that of Dr. Hatfield in Streeter's book of essays under the title of "The Spirit". This learned physician, followed by all other writers in the volume, takes the position that the Unconscious is the real sphere of action of the Holy Spirit. The inspiration of the prophet and the Pentecost of the Church were alike mediated through this as the deep-seated point of contact between humanity and Divine power. One is reminded of S. Augustine's immortal doctrine that the roots of human life and thought are "in Deum". So the Spirit of God would then not come *down upon,* so much as come *up through* the personal self of man, refining and exalting in its progress every pure and noble instinct, and driving upward and outward every alien and evil influence. There are many spiritual facts which such a conception would help to make intelligible.

In line with this is the religious use of the fact of suggestion. Not only the miracles of healing, but the exorcism of demons, and the adjustment of disordered or wreck-

ed mentalities which is so remarkable a feature of our Lord's ministry, might find interpretation here. The Emanuel movement, the Faith Cure, the schools of mental healing, the work of Coué, and some, not all, of the cures of Christian Science, become more intelligible when brought under the sweeping canopy of the power of suggestion.

Every clergyman has at one time or another come into contact with one of the above classes of ailments—that of a life disorganized by one-sidedness. A high legal official once called upon a student of the Emanuel movement and presented the case of his wife, a woman of thirty-five in danger of insanity from insomnia. Careful inquiry revealed one of those characters so often met with—a soul with but one idea—itself and its pleasures: all other sides of the nature being driven back upon themselves until they became a peril for want of satisfaction. The complete reorganization of the nature on sound and harmonious lines worked a cure in six months, restoring to health, home, and God a mind originally beautiful, but warped and twisted out of all its first promise by a false way of living.

If the memories of the clergy were levied upon, similar cases of resuscitation would no doubt emerge by the thousand. The age of miracles is not past, only some things once thought miraculous have become ordinary facts in the Christian sphere. There is every probability that the indisputable efficacy of unction for the sick falls under the same law of suggestion; and a cogent argument for its restoration as the lost Pleiad of our sacramental constellation has been founded upon such a position as the above.

The New Psychology has its defects, and they are grave. A few only can be mentioned in an essay already long.

It is at present defective in its treatment of the concept of *Will*. The system lends itself easily to a mere subjectivism, or even to a stark determinism, binding all the powers of man in chains to an immutable Fate whose residence is in himself.

It is defective in its explanation of the religious instinct—a fact of human life far too universal to be merely a compound of other instincts of the nature.

It is defective also in its habit of reasoning from the abnormal to the normal, instead

of vice versa. The phenomena of the irrational are no guide to us in our study of the rational except by way of contrast. But all such points are matters of adjustment, and will no doubt clear themselves on closer consideration. Meanwhile religion has to thank the New Psychology for most interesting and valuable interpretations of spiritual method, of the twilight land between the body and the soul, of some of the greatest truths of theology, and above all of the modus operandi of spiritual power.

When the huge bridge across Hell gate in New York was being constructed, it was found that at a certain point the caisson could not be sunk on account of an old forgotten wreck. No power known to modern engineering availed to dislodge the wooden mass from its bed amidst the ooze and slime, until an inventive genius moored a floating dock above it which was attached to the wreck by chains, and left there until the tide began to flow. At full flood the tide did what man could not do, raised the derelict inch by inch, until it could be moved out to sea, where the chains were removed and the obstruction sunk fathoms deep to the bottom of the ocean

bed. So this revelation of wondrous energy welling up through the deeper self of man, may have a corresponding value toward his spiritual redemption, and the tides of the Spirit may once more manifest the virtue and the lifting power of a new Pentecost.

## LENIN AND LINCOLN

THE physical appearance of these two men does not help much towards a comparative estimate of their work or their opinions, yet it may be of use as contributing to that total impression which lies at the basis of judgment. Neither would have had any success as an artist's model. Nor could the well-worn phrase "Hyperion to a satyr" have been used to do justice to the fair proportions of the one at the expense of the other. The recollection of Lincoln's portrait has been revived among us through the fine statue by Saint-Gaudens now standing in Parliament Square, Westminster. The tall figure, lean and loose-hung, the remarkable head and powerfully cut features, the hollow cheeks, overhanging brows, deep set eyes at once humorous and sad, the wide high forehead and bushy black hair, are picturesque and individual to the point of distinction. A type of face to look twice at on the street—a type which women would call "interesting",

and which men instinctively find attractive—a type whose vocation to high influence is stamped upon every line.

Lenin is different and in many points the antipodes of this. The mental picture to be gained from the tract "Some Bolshevist Portraits", gives us a man of 53 years old; of noble, *not* peasant stock, like many of the earlier revolutionaries in France; a scholar from the universities of Kazan and Petrograd; the possessor of a working knowledge of both English and German; an exile to Siberia for Socialist offences. Physically, a short man, plump, with a thick neck, broad shoulders, and a round, red face. The forehead is the most striking feature, it is high and intellectual, the head is bald, the nose slightly turned-up, the moustache brownish, the beard short and stubby, the aspect that of a provincial grocer rather than of a born leader of men. He is in complete contrast to Trotsky his former confrêre, whose goggle eyes, fierce moustache, and pointed beard are those of some sixteenth century pirate plying his craft upon the Spanish Main.

This external unlikeness is matched by a corresponding dissimilarity in mental nature. The world has come to look upon the great President not only as the successful pilot of his nation through the storms of civil war, but as one of the protagonists of rational and common sense democracy. "His Policy," said a speaker at the unveiling of the statue in Westminster, "his policy was plain common sense." The definition in the Gettysburg address, "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people," has passed into the world's blood. The critical eye will not find it faultless of course. Theology will ask for a higher doctrine of the origin of government; social philosophy can scarce be content with it unless the rights of minorities are regarded; history will question any such formula on other grounds. Yet after all reservations in the interest of science, it is doubtful if any better working theory of democratic order has ever been uttered by the lips of man. Concise and popular, it has become sanctified in the heart of average humanity by the baptism of fire amidst which it was conceived, and the baptism of blood with which the first stage of

its translation into fact was closed. The vision of a perfect state in Plato's Republic leaves one cold; it is a dream spun from threads of beauty, but spun within a wise man's brain. Rousseau's great exposition of social origins has doubtless penetrated far into the body of modern political thought, and is still bearing fruit for good or evil in the most surprising quarters. But the array of facts necessary for the social deductions at the foundation of such work had not been assembled in Rousseau's day. Lincoln's utterance depends neither upon the imagination nor upon the marshalling of social phenomena—it is the spiritual interpretation of society by a man of great heart and with an insight akin to genius.

The conception of Lenin differs in being a purely intellectual construction. To make this clear it will be necessary to examine it in more or less detail.

Bolshevism is well-known to be an offshoot of the Russian Social Democratic Working Men's Party of 1897. An extreme radical fraction of this party was in the majority (Bolshe) at a Congress held outside of Russia in 1903. Hence the name. In

1917 this fraction altered its title to the Russian Communist Party (Bolshevist). The leading spirits were Marxian in their social doctrine.

As might be expected, therefore, Capitalism is the grand enemy. "The hour has struck for a settlement with capitalist class rule." "The present is the period of destruction and crushing of the capitalist systems of the whole world." "The dictatorship of the proletariat must be the occasion for the immediate expropriation of capital."

The destruction of Capitalism means also the destruction of the *bourgeoisie,* which includes "all who can afford to pay for the services of another." "The aim of the proletariat must now be immediately to conquer power. To conquer power means to destroy the governmental apparatus of the bourgeoisie and to organize a new proletarian governmental apparatus." The method is *Revolution* and that of the most drastic kind, leaving the enemy "only his eyes to weep with." Revolution to Lenin was not only a change of government, but the extermination or enslavement of every class above the proletariat.

"In order to protect the socialist revolution—it becomes necesary to disarm entirely the bourgeoisie and to arm the proletariat." "Bourgeois, put yourselves to work, gentlemen. If you wait until we put a couple of Red Guards over you, it will soon be easy for you to remove the snow!" There has to be a return to first conditions; the entire tradition of past government must be obliterated as a bad dream. It is like Post-Impressionist art with its throw-back to primitive impressions of the universe.

The weapon is *Force,* and the hands that wield it are those of the Soviet—Russian for council—a body of working men, or peasants, or of the Red Guard, or the Navy, or any class of toiler. Local Soviets may be organized in any factory, or commune; even in apartment houses. They grade up stage by stage in ever-extending areas of representation to the All-Russian Council or Soviets, of which elected executive Lenin was the head. The franchise is taken away from employers of Labour, gentlemen of means, merchants, ministers, the police and secret service of the old régime, the feeble-minded, and all who have become obnoxious to a So-

viet. Property is nationalized without compensation, for apportionment among the toilers according to ability by the local and central Soviets. The general management of internal and foreign affairs is in the hand of a Council of People's Commissars, elected by and responsible to the Central Executive. Prices are regulated by urban or other committees whose duties it is to fix values, adjust business, and distribute profits among the various establishments. An insurance Council exists whose province is the entire administration of workman's insurance, with veto-power in the hands of the Commissar of Labour. The eight-hour law is made universal; "It applies to all establishments and industries, and to all persons employed in hired labour." Civil marriage only is recognized, though church marriage is allowed as a private affair. The marriageable age is 18 for men and 16 for women except in Transcaucasia where it is 16 and 13 respectively. The parties may take the surname of either or combine both into a new surname. Illegitimacy does not bar a child from family rights. Divorce is granted by the courts on petition of either or both of

the parties to a marriage, and all ecclesiastical jurisdiction in such matters is denied. Justice is defined as "the organ of the power of the proletariat and of the poorest peasants." The administration of justice is placed in the hands of judges "elected on the basis of direct democratic vote." There is right of appeal to an arbitration court. There are also revolutionary tribunals for the handling of offences against the new system; offences against national property; and others of a like nature. Education is to be carried on under careful inspection, but its chief object is to rear each young generation in the principles of *Communism*. For the work of repression Extraordinary Commissions exist whose performance of their duties cannot be criticized for lack of zeal.

Such is the new machinery which has replaced the ancient autocracy of Holy Russia. Its institution was marked by a "Reign of Terror" unheard of in history—massacre, outrage, and fiendish brutality on the grand scale, of which an outstanding instance was the butchery of the 400 officers of the Black Sea Fleet.

The ultimate object is *world-control.* Lenin put his ambition into one pregnant sentence. "We aim at the closest union and the complete merging of the workmen and peasants of all nations of the world into a single World-wide Soviet Republic."

Extraordinary enthusiasm greets the planting of the Communist Third International in any new country. Zinoviev, President of the Petrograd Soviet exclaims, "Long live the future ruler of the world, the great Communist International"! In the Pravda of Nov. 7th, 1919 he prophesies, "in one year or two years the Communist International will rule the whole world." Hear his appeal to the workingmen of France: "Comrades, it is time to break your chains, to take power into your hands and to replace the democracy of the bourgeoisie slave-owners by a proletarian democracy or democracy of the enslaved classes. Prepare for social revolution using all legal and illegal means." He is in line with Lenin his erstwhile leader; "Either the dictatorship of landlords and capitalists or the dictatorship of the working class. There is no middle course."

This rapid review of the net-work of political machinery now covering Russia is enough to convince the most skeptical that Lenin and his associates showed a certain genius for organization. Within three years an entire social system of eight centuries growth, highly centralized, entrenched in the interest if not the affections of large sections of the nation, was swept out of existence, and replaced by an organization entirely novel and experimental. The atrocious crimes and barbarities ushering in the new régime do not obliterate the wonder of this fact. Such a feat could not have been accomplished save by talent of exceptional order, by iron courage, and inflexible will. Credit for these qualities must be allotted to Lenin. He showed a giant grasp of the situation, a masterful energy, great wisdom in choosing his associates, and remorseless devotion to his idea and method.

The singular fact is that this policy of *Thorough* should not have so far won success in the restoration of happiness to the people. If the reports which reach us are to be trusted, the situation of the Russian toilers is wretched in the extreme. They

have taken a post-graduate degree in misery. The iron hand of dynastic tyranny has been followed by even more ruthless and boundless power under the Soviet. The material condition of the country has never been worse; wages have risen but they are paid in paper money, and prices have risen in excessive ratio. A typical example is that of the employees in a certain electric station. The owner had a salary list of 8,000 rubles a month. After the Revolution the workmen "entreated" him for 98,000 rubles per month, which he had to give them. He went to the municipality and pointed out that the existing price of 35 kopeks per hectowatt was impossible, but they advised him to go and take a walk. His workmen came again in a few weeks and told him to "get out." They then raised the price ten times. The municipality paid, and increased taxation to square matters, much to the discomfiture of the employees. In many cases salaries have been raised to twice the natural value of the products. And the flood of paper currency flows on unchecked, bringing ever nearer the final bankruptcy of the nation. The Iszvestia, the Soviet organ, tells us that "the gen-

eral phenomenon is the chaos of industry and the absence of accounting." This has not been owing to the lack of expert knowledge and management. For it has been the policy of Lenin and his successors to employ bourgeois specialists. They are to be sucked dry of their knowledge and then flung aside. Under no circumstances are they to be accepted as members of the proletariat. "The doors of the party are wide open for the workman and workwoman, but there are strong gates against every kind of Soviet employee." They may even be paid high salaries or put for a time into positions of control. The expense is nothing. Lenin asked the question, "Can one consider the expense of 50 or 100 millions of rubles against the restoration of industry? Certainly not." With equal cynicism he wrote during the war: "The French officer de Lubersac was sent to me. "I am a monarchist, my only aim is the defeat of Germany," he declared. "That goes without saying," I answered. That in no wise prevented me from opening my mind to him upon the subject of the services that French officers, specialists of ability, could render to us in mining the railways against

the German offensive. That was an example of "entente" which will be approved by every intelligent workman, an entente in the interest of Socialism. I grasped the hand of the French monarchist; even while we both knew perfectly either of us would have willingly hung his partner. But our interests coincided for the moment."

Society is thus to be converted into a bureau—a factory where labour and salary will be equal for all, though such a *regime d'usine* was not regarded by Lenin as the final end. "It is only a necessary step towards the root and branch suppression of that infamy which is capitalistic exploitation. From the moment when the great majority if not the totality of the members of society have learned how to direct the State, will all government become absolutely useless. The more complete the democracy, the nearer the instant when that government will show itself superfluous. The State formed by the armed workmen, will no longer be a State in the proper sense of the term; and the State in any form will rapidly begin to die." The last phase is thus the complete disappearance of government. After all have learned

the art of administration and the effective direction of Social production, with the control of shirkers, junkers, liars, and other "supports of capitalism," by consequence all disobedience to the rules of control and responsibility set up by the people will have become so difficult as to be practically impossible. Well might Etienne Buisson remark "Suppress capital and abolish the State; nothing more is necessary for the human race to rediscover the secret of a free, happy, and fruitful life. One sees that the Moscow dictator is much nearer the Communist Anarchists than the Marxian Socialists."

The democracy in which Lincoln believed must always have an irreconcilable quarrel with any system such as that outlined above. No statesman in modern times has given higher appreciation to the people than he, an appreciation expressed in his well-known saying, "God must love the common people for he made so many of them." But it was the people as a whole whom Lincoln valued, proletariat and bourgeoisie alike. He ranked high, as a national asset, the push and thrift and industry which lift a man out of

the ranks of unskilled toil even if the outcome of effort be only "three acres and a cow." The intelligence no less than the wealth of communities is exemplified in all such endeavour. To protect it in the achievement and in the enjoyment of the fruit of its labour would have seemed to him one of the important and manifest duties of government, and he would have rejected with indignation the Bolshevist doctrine that bourgeoisie and exploitation are convertible terms. His principle of reform was the constructive one of the recognition of human rights for every individual, and the insistence that the individual shall live up to the rights he thus enjoys as a part of the civic body. This creed, derivable in its political aspects from Rousseau, was carried, some think, to an extreme in the grant to the emancipated negro of the status of political equality with his white fellow-citizen. But the President's conception of human nature led him to believe that the colored man's consciousness would level up by degrees to the trust reposed in it. Moreover, Lincoln's view of democracy tended towards distrust of the government by theory rather than

by experience upon which Bolshevism is founded.

Lenin was like Robespierre in much of his political outlook. He seems to have resembled the "Great Incorruptible" in the simplicity and honour of his personal life. He is said to have felt a similar repugnance to bloodshed, if less sanguinary measures were of use; in which he differed from Trotzky. His private life was contented and happy. But he was like the Frenchman in being the slave of one idea. The power to see into the heart of a subject and yet to envisage it in all its manifold relations, which was so remarkable a characteristic of Burke, was absent from the Russian's make-up. The world's political past is full of warnings against such men. The trust of authority in their hands becomes a peril striking at the very life of society. The complex interests of nations—often so delicate in balance—are threatened throughout their equipoise by the uncompromising thrust of the political theorist. Earthquakes in society as in the realm of physical nature shatter more than they adjust; and it is instructive to notice the consummate wisdom with which Lincoln,

in an era full of theorising, trod the straight and narrow path traced out by experience, "feeding his people with a faithful and true heart and ruling them prudently with all his power."

In the atrocities of the Russian Revolution it is possible that the American leader might have discerned the finger of the Nemesis ever-waiting to avenge a glaring wrong. With the immediate avengers he could have had no sympathy, of course, but his knowledge of the law of retribution would have taught him that the crimes of the Russian czardom and bureaucracy were destined to be wiped out in blood. This is the spirit of those memorable words in the Second Inaugural: "If God wills that this mighty scourge of war continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn by the lash shall be paid by another drawn by the sword, as was said three thousand years ago so still it must be said, "The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether." The cruelty and inhumanity of which Ivan the Terrible was a type, turn the inward

nature of the sufferer into a volcano of hatred whose lava must sometime overflow. The conscience of all aristocracies whether of wealth or birth—whether in the Old World or the New—may well be stung into reflection by these records of social revenge. The best preventive of such tragedies is the habit of self-questioning: "Am I and my order making by our services such a contribution to the world's well-being, as to justify our right to exist within that world? Is privilege of position or command of resources blinding us to the abuses under which the unprivileged suffer?"

But the crowning indictment which the mind of Lincoln would bring against the democracy of Lenin is that it is not democracy at all, but the rankest and starkest *class-government* with the nightmare of a new autocracy to afflict its dreams. The disfranchisement of the middle class, with the partial or total extinction of the class possessing wealth not only destroys the conservative section of the nation, but robs it of some of its most enterprising and fruitful elements. Deprivation of civic rights is certain to kill out all interest in government

and to inflict a deadly wound upon the sense of civic responsibility. Moreover, the withholding of a proprietary right in the fruit of man's personal toil strikes at the root of initiative and enterprise, and eventually drains off into other lands the mass of any nation's industrial strength.

Such a social structure on the part of the proletariat must be, and is, class-government in an extreme form. It makes political pariahs out of Octobrists, Menshevists, and everything else that has not bowed the knee to the image set up by the Bolshevist Nebuchadnezzar; and it maintains this injustice by power. It is to be expected that Lenin and his ideas will have their vogue. Dreamers of social perfection will make him an idol, until a closer acquaintance unfolds the cold cruelty and heartlessness of his régime. That freelance among political thinkers, H. G. Wells, was once said to have taken the plunge into Sovietism, but he found the waters too chill. It is amusing to recall his former views. In a personal letter, photographed in fac-simile in "Upton Sinclair's Magazine" five and-a-half years ago, he wrote as follows: "Don't write me down

Bolshevik . . . . Lenin is a little beast like this. (drawing) He just wants power. He doesn't eat well or live prettily or get children or care for beautiful things. He doesn't want order; he hates machines about as much as he hates life. He's just a Russian Sidney Webb, a rotten little incessant egotistical intriguer. He and the Kaiser ought to be killed by some moral sanitary authority." The most extravagant estimate comes from a brilliant American feminist who hails him as the "greatest European genius of recent years." Such incense is at present burned only by a few. The propaganda now on foot in mine and factory affects only those whose main hope of fortune lies in a chance at the social grab bag. The workingman with a savings bank account or a house and lot is never revolutionary. A counter-propaganda should be set on foot by every government, flooding workshop, home and school, with tracts and pamphlets setting forth for the plain man the principles of true democratic order. There is one weapon which Bolshevism can never withstand—it is the Ithuriel spear of reason.

If the few fragments of news which are allowed to escape from Russia prove true, then the stars in their courses are already fighting against Sisera. The effort to foster trade with foreign countries not as yet blessed by Soviet rule, is a flat contradiction of some of the first principles by which Lenin and his followers swore to live and die. In natural sequence to such an effort, comes the astounding admission that the peasant is not as yet a Communist, with the more than hint that it is impossible to make him so. The surprise is that any social thinker not quite a monomaniac should have dreamt that a peasantry bred up in the tradition of the village *mir,* could ever become permanently Bolshevistic. The *mir* combines in a happy form of union two of the foundation facts of human labour; the principle that a man has a right to share in the fruits of his toil, and the principle which recognizes the community's part in the conditions making that fruitful toil a possibility. The threatened breakdown of all production and commercial life in Russia is forcing Bolshevism away from its former position towards a compromise with Capital. "The wheel has come

full circle." Human nature itself stood out in armour against Lenin, so soon as his defiance of these elementary laws of industrial progress became apparent.

We have made no reference to the "dictatorship" of the proletariat, which means in fact the dictatorship of one man. That wholly undemocratic thing is justified by Bolshevist writers as a measure of transition consequent upon the era of change. A tyranny which has once tasted the sweets of power has been found hard to dislodge except by counter-revolution. But the limits of this essay have been reached. Enough has been said to prove the thesis that Lincoln and Lenin can never shake hands in agreement. The marriage of Democracy and Bolshevism would be an unholy union, only secured by the complete capitulation of one to the other. In the Bolshevism of Lenin there is the annihilation of personality, and the prostration of the organic life of the people before the shrine of a monstrous idea. One is grounded deep in faith in God and in human nature; the other, as Farbman has said, is rooted in pessimism and in the counsels of despair.